

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 12 are canceled, claims 13 to 45 are added, and therefore claims 13 to 45 are now pending.

New claims 13 to 45 do not add any new matter and are supported in the specification.

With respect to paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 to 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the Yamamoto or Whitley references. With respect to paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the Yamamoto reference. With respect to paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 9 to 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by the Whitley reference. With respect to paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 8 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by the Ganachaud, King, Shimamura or Ehrman references. With respect to paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claims 5 to 7 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by the King or Ehrman references. With respect to paragraph 7 of the Office Action, claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by the King or Shimamura references.

While the rejections may not be agreed with, to facilitate matters, claims 1 to 12 have been canceled, and new claims 13 to 45 have been added to better define the claimed subject matter. It is believed and respectfully submitted that any review of the references relied upon makes plain that they do not identically describe (or even suggest) all of the features of claim 13, or of its dependent claims 14 to 45, including the feature of a “collection arrangement that includes adjacent and separate chambers, wherein a first one of the chambers is used as a temporary storage chamber for liquid fuel and is connectable to a return line in the fuel tank, wherein the chambers are configured so that for an approximately horizontal alignment of the fuel tank or the ventilation/pressure-equalizing system, liquid fuel does not travel from one of the chambers into the other of the chambers, wherein the liquid fuel that penetrates the ventilation/pressure-equalizing system is collected in the temporary storage chamber and emptiable via the return line”, so that claim 13 is allowable, as are its dependent claims 14 to 45.

As further regards dependent claim 18, it further provides that the collection arrangement is configured to connect the return line and de-aeration lines to one another, the de-aeration lines each ending in a different one of the chambers of the collection arrangement, and that a first one of the de-aeration lines is arranged between the collection arrangement

Appl. No. 10/023,322
Att. Docket No. 10537/191
Response To Office Action of 05/28/03

and a tube line on a side of the fuel tank for discharging gases or fuel vapors from the main reservoir of the fuel tank, and a second one of the de-aeration lines is arranged between the collection arrangement and a line element located outside of the fuel tank, which are not identically described (or even suggested) by the references relied upon.

As further regards dependent claim 28, it further provides that the de-aeration lines inside of the fuel tank both empty into the first chamber of the collection arrangement, which is arranged in a middle region of the fuel tank, above a maximum fuel level for a horizontally arranged fuel tank, the first chamber forming a reservoir for liquid fuel that starts from the de-aeration lines and expands in an upward direction, and that the second chamber is arranged adjacent or above the first chamber, wherein a discharge-side of the second chamber extends directly over and into one of the de-aeration lines, which are not identically described (or even suggested) by the references relied upon.

With respect to paragraph 8 of the Office Action, claims 1 to 12 were rejected as indefinite under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. It is noted that as to the indefiniteness rejections, the Office Action only refers to one of the embodiments in the present application. In view of the new claims, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn as moot.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, since new claims 13 to 45 are allowable, so as to obviate the arguments of the Office Action.

Accordingly, claims 13 to 45 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the rejections have been obviated, and that claims 13 to 45 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON

Dated: 8/26/2003

By: Richard L. Mayer

Richard L. Mayer
(Reg. No. 22,490)

One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

620776